



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,589	12/22/2000	Roger W. March	10519/9	2666

757 7590 03/12/2002

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

PORTKA, GARY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2187

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/748,589

Applicant(s)  
March et al.

Examiner  
Gary J. Portka

Group Art Unit  
2187



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gary J. Portka (PTO)

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Joseph Hetz (Applicant's Representative)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Mar 6, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 104, 109, 114, 117, and 120

Identification of prior art discussed:  
Shirane 5,796,694, and Carson 5,432,729.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The parties discussed possible distinctions between the references and the claimed invention. Applicant's representative argued that with regard to claims 104 and 109, the ECC being integrated within the write once device and contained within a modular housing differentiated from the references. It was also argued that with regard to claims 114, 117, and 120, the three dimensional device is composed of memory cells stacked on a single substrate, unlike the supplied reference. The claims will be reviewed for possible related amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

*Gary J Portka*